

In The Matter Of:
State of Nevada Public Works Division
State Public Works Board Meeting

September 6, 2018

Capitol Reporters
123 W. Nye Lane, Ste 107

Carson City, Nevada 89706

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Page 1

1 STATE OF NEVADA
2 PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION
3 STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD MEETING NOTICE & AGENDA
4 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5 Regulation Adoption Hearing
6 VIDEO-CONFERENCED OPEN MEETING
7 CARSON CITY/LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
8 THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2018
9
10
11 The Board: Bryce Clutts, Chairperson
12 Sean Stewart, Vice Chairperson
13 Tito Tiberti, Member
14 Clint Bentley, Member
15 Adam Hand, Member
16 Kevin Lewis, Member
17 Patrick Cates, Direct, Department of
18 Administration, Member
19
20
21
22
23 For the Board: Susan Stewart,
24 Deputy Attorney General
Construction Law Counsel

Jeffrey D. Menicucci,
Deputy Attorney General
Bureau of Government Affairs

Reported by: Michel Loomis, RPR
NV CCR #228
123 West Nye Lane, Suite 107

Page 2

1 MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
2 AGENDA
3 1. Roll Call 3
4 2. Public Comment 4
5 Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No
6 action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until
7 the matter is included on an agenda item as an item on which
8 action may be taken. At the Chair's discretion, public
9 comment may be limited to five minutes per person.
10 3. For Possible Action: Discussion and Possible Action on
11 the Administrator's Recommendation to the Board for the 2019
12 Capital Improvement Program. 6,61
13 4. For Possible Action: Board Comment and Discussion 62
14 5. Public Comment 64
15 Public comments will be taken during this agenda item. No
16 action may be taken on a matter raised under this item until
17 the matter is included on an agenda item as an item on which
18 action may be taken. At the Chair's discretion, public
19 comment may be limited to five minutes per person. 64
20 6. Adjournment 64
21
22
23
24

Page 3

1 CARSON CITY, NEVADA, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2018, 9:00 A.M.
2 -o0o-
3
4 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Okay. We're going to get
5 started. This is the time and the place of the State Public
6 Works board meeting for Thursday, September 6th, 2018, at
7 9:00 a.m. Roll call.
8 MS. PASCIAK: Chairperson, Bryce Clutts.
9 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Present.
10 MS. PASCIAK: Vice Chairperson, Sean Stewart.
11 MEMBER STEWART: Present.
12 MS. PASCIAK: Member, Clint Bentley.
13 MEMBER BENTLEY: Present.
14 MS. PASCIAK: Member, Adam Hand.
15 MEMBER HAND: Present.
16 MS. PASCIAK: Member, Tito Tiberti.
17 MEMBER TIBERTI: Present.
18 MS. PASCIAK: Member, Kevin Lewis.
19 MEMBER LEWIS: Present.
20 MS. PASCIAK: Member, Patrick Cates.
21 DIRECTOR CATES: Present.
22 MS. PASCIAK: We have a quorum.
23 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. Moving on to
24 Agenda Item Number 2.

Page 4

1 Public Comment. Is there any Public comment?
2 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Yes.
3 MEMBER BENTLEY: Yes, down here.
4 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Ma'am, please state your
5 name for the record.
6 MS. KELLER: Good morning. My name Erin Keller.
7 I am the associate vice president of Institutional Advancement
8 at Nevada State College. President Patterson sends his
9 regrets for not being able to be here today, but he is at the
10 Board of Regents meeting.
11 At your last meeting, when we presented, you had
12 questions about our fundraising efforts and we wanted to come
13 and present an update this morning.
14 Last night, President Patterson received a phone
15 call that secured the lead gift for our \$6 million match for
16 this building. That, along with our other fundraising
17 efforts, we believe we will have the \$6 million secured by
18 some time this fall. We are very excited about this building.
19 As you may have heard, Nevada State College has
20 been the second fastest-growing four-year institution in the
21 country for the last two years; and then this year, we
22 increased our class size again by another 15 percent.
23 This building is imperative for our growth to be
24 able to educate our youth, to get more teachers and nurses in

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 5</p> <p>1 the classrooms and in the southern Nevada pipeline and state 2 pipeline. Thank you. 3 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Keller. 4 Is there any questions? I appreciate it. 5 Is there any other public comment? Hearing none. 6 MEMBER TIBERTI: So, my question would be -- 7 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Member Tiberti. 8 MEMBER TIBERTI: -- Chairman, on my favorite page 9 15, capital three, education and building, it says, "other, 10 \$6 million." Is that what we're referring to when -- from the 11 other comments just now? 12 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Tiberti. 13 Mr. Ward, Ward Patrick? 14 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick -- yes, ward Patrick 15 for the record. 16 Yes, Member Tiberti, that is what we're referring 17 to. So those -- you've heard the statements about their 18 efforts to secure the \$6 million on page 15 for 19 Project CAP-023 we'll be discussing later in the presentation. 20 MEMBER TIBERTI: Thank you. 21 MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman? 22 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Ms. Stewart. 23 MS. STEWART: Just for a point of order, we would 24 ask that everybody remember we have a court reporter that's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 7</p> <p>1 we'll be going through today. And so we'll be talking a 2 little bit about our vision, mission and philosophy. We'll be 3 discussing deferred maintenance and the backlog of deferred 4 maintenance here at the State and overview. 5 We'll go through the prioritization of the 6 projects. The Board has provided a system to prioritizing 7 projects in these three categories that are listed: Deferred 8 maintenance, capital construction and historic preservation. 9 And then we'll give you a summary of the 10 recommended costs, broken out by these three areas and by the 11 state funding needed and other funding needed. 12 We didn't discuss this at our prior meeting, but 13 the vision is that state agencies will occupy exemplary 14 facilities. Our mission here is to provide well planned, 15 efficient and safe facilities to state agencies so they can 16 effectively administer their programs. 17 As always, we work as a team to build consensus, 18 take pride in our work and serve with humility. Here, we have 19 a graph that includes the deferred maintenance that was 20 approved in the past, actually funded in the capital 21 improvement program. So you'll see that being the lower 22 orange line. And if you look at the first five of those six 23 years, the average of that is \$44 million. The average of 24 that decade, 44 million per two-year period.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 6</p> <p>1 transcribing everything. It's important that you identify 2 yourself first and that you also speak a little slower perhaps 3 than normal, so that she can record everything that's being 4 said. And also that we be careful that only one of us talk at 5 a time. Thank you. 6 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart. 7 Are there any other questions related to public 8 comment? 9 Hearing none, moving onto Agenda Item Number 3 10 for possible action: Administrators recommendations to the 11 Board for the 2019 capital improvement program. 12 Mr. Patrick. 13 MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 14 We have a PowerPoint presentation here, available 15 for everybody. I believe everybody has one. 16 This is in accordance with NRS 341.100, Section 17 D, subpart A. "The administrator shall prepare and submit to 18 the Board, for its approval, the recommended priority for 19 proposed capital improvements projects and provide the Board 20 with an estimate of the cost of each project." 21 We provided you the cost estimates for all the 22 projects that were submitted so far. Today, we're just 23 primarily going to be presenting this on the priority order. 24 We've outlined here, on the second page, what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 8</p> <p>1 Last session, the board contemplated and the 2 chairman sent a letter to the governor's office, requesting 3 that the 2017 CIP include \$114 million of deferred 4 maintenance, and that is what was approved. 5 We'll go into that letter a little further later 6 in the presentation. The gray line here is CIP deferred 7 maintenance request. So these are the actual numbers that the 8 board has heard in the hearings in late August of 2016, which 9 was two years ago, and late August of 2018, only a few weeks 10 ago. 11 And so the total deferred maintenance requests 12 estimated by the project managers and at the public works 13 board was 478 million in August of 2016. And what we heard a 14 few weeks ago was a total of 623 million of requests for 15 deferred maintenance. So you can see this large spike. And 16 some of that may be attributed to inflationary pressures as 17 well as a growing need for maintenance. 18 In the 2017 CIP, there were 619 requests for 19 funding; and in the 2019 CIP, there were 750. So a growth of 20 approximately 15 percent in the number of requests, and you 21 can see the change in the dollar value here. 22 Finally, the third item here is our facility 23 condition analysis. And so we have a group that goes and 24 looks at all of our state-owned buildings and determines the</p>

1 needs of the various buildings. And so last session, we had
2 these first five years of information presented to you with
3 the current backlog being \$301 million.

4 And so now we see this large spike here and we
5 look at about a third of all the bienniums, a third of all the
6 buildings per biennium. So this increase here relates to
7 inflationary pressures. It also relates to taking more of a
8 systems approach in doing the estimating, and that is going to
9 move us into the area that we've been talking about is what we
10 call our proactive -- our proactive CIP where the PM's work
11 directly, works with the facility condition analysis work.

12 And so ultimately, over time, you're going to see
13 where this gray line and this intermediate line, I don't know,
14 there's kind of two orange scales here, say peach, this peach
15 line, they're going to merge because we're going to be doing a
16 proactive CIP and those will end up being one effort.

17 So we're taking -- to summarize that, we're
18 taking a systems -- more of a systems approach and that's how
19 the PM's do their work as opposed to a bits and pieces of,
20 say, an air handler, for instance, replacing a fan or
21 replacing a motor or a variable frequency drive, we would
22 replace systems. So you see that moving through here, the
23 systems approach and a proactive CIP.

24 DIRECTOR CATES: Could I make a comment on that?

1 MR. PATRICK: Sure.

2 DIRECTOR CATES: Director Cates.

3 So when I look at the figure for facility
4 condition analysis 2017, 301, when you look at a facility
5 condition analysis report for a building, it may have multiple
6 things in it. Some that need to be done immediately, some
7 that need to be done several years out. So is this just the
8 things that are more immediate or is it everything in the
9 report?

10 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record.

11 That's a good question. So these are in line
12 with the requests that say that the various agencies make. Is
13 it a ten-year life cycle? So we do have some performance
14 indicators that we report that relate to the number one and
15 number two priorities, which means things that should be done
16 within the first four years. This is a ten-year life cycle
17 approach.

18 DIRECTOR CATES: Okay. Okay. And if I could
19 just -- one other comment, and for you to comment on the
20 facility condition analysis reports.

21 My understanding is, traditionally, they were
22 fairly superficial reviews of the buildings and what was
23 needed for them. And I think there has been a tendency for
24 people to point to those as the word on what needs to be done

1 to buildings. And it probably tends to -- historically, it
2 has probably tended to underestimate the need.

3 And I know that while Gus was still here, that he
4 made some changes to that process that I think you were
5 speaking to, a more systems approach, more holistic look, a
6 little deeper dive.

7 I just wanted to say that was my understanding
8 and if you want to comment on that.

9 MR. PATRICK: Yeah, that's basically what we were
10 talking about there is the systems approach versus the -- the
11 approach in the past has been what would maintenance benefit
12 the most from this information, you know. So we, too, are
13 with the maintenance staff. We don't do any destructive
14 testing.

15 DIRECTOR CATES: Right.

16 MR. PATRICK: Rely on the maintenance staff a lot
17 to come up with these. Now we're looking at working more as a
18 team here at Public Works with the project managers and the
19 facility condition analysis group and to provide more of a
20 holistic group of systems.

21 So regarding -- you know, there's going --
22 there's likely to be some transition between this thing that
23 we call the proactive CIP, isn't something we're going to turn
24 a switch on and all of a sudden be doing it.

1 And so I would point out the facility condition
2 analysis was basically set up as a -- in regards -- in
3 response to statutory requirement to visit all the buildings.

4 DIRECTOR CATES: Right.

5 MR. PATRICK: And so that statutory requirement
6 still exists and will need to be honored. And these -- this
7 effort here, so all the buildings -- so we determined we would
8 try to visit all the buildings in a six-year period.

9 So there's, say, approximately 2,000 -- 1800
10 buildings, we'll say, divided by six years is 300 buildings
11 per year. So you can see where you can't go into too much
12 depth if you've got two people visiting 300 buildings a year
13 and there's only 200 days in a year.

14 DIRECTOR CATES: Right.

15 MR. PATRICK: Working days, excluding -- you
16 know, 200 working days. So we just see that these two
17 systems, the CIP process and the facility condition analysis,
18 will eventually emerge. And so that's down the road.

19 DIRECTOR CATES: Perfect. Thank you. I just
20 think that was important to get a little more clarity on that
21 on the record. It was a really big change and it really
22 explains the hockey stick on your draft. It will probably
23 keep going up, I imagine, as you cycle through six years of
24 reviews.

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 13</p> <p>1 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 2 Certainly, that will happen, and then inflation 3 also had a role in that, as well. 4 DIRECTOR CATES: Thank you. 5 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 6 Looking at the prioritizing criteria for deferred 7 maintenance, we went through this in some detail at the last 8 meeting. I would just offer that the first group of projects 9 we'll see in deferred maintenance are legal requirements. 10 The second group would be other deferred 11 maintenance, which includes essential facilities and other 12 facilities and in continuation of deferred maintenance of 13 projects. 14 We won't be going through all 73 of these 15 deferred maintenance projects in any great level of detail, 16 but I would like to hit the legal related projects early on. 17 Indoor quality is our first project under legal 18 requirements, and you see under "other funding," there's 19 \$100,000, which comes from risk management. And this area 20 here is largely geared towards mold abatement and leak 21 control, and we find that this is a very proactive process to 22 mitigate being into our quality problems. And so, again, 23 working in concert with the Division of Risk Management. 24 Fire alarm system replacement, you know, this is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Ward, is there a 2 spare copy of this? I'm having a rough time following you. 3 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick. There's some out on 4 the table, I believe, there. 5 DIRECTOR CATES: Page 6. 6 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Got it. 7 MS. STEWART: There's a stack out front. 8 SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Oh, I didn't know. 9 MR. PATRICK: And a similar requirement -- Ward 10 Patrick, for the record. A similar requirement on Project 42 11 would be the -- providing hot water for the Veteran's nursing 12 homes. We discussed ADA Item 60. 13 Groundwater well abandonments, EPA requires this 14 project. The state-wide building officials, statute requires 15 the State Public Works division to be the authority having 16 jurisdiction and this is other funding, meaning agencies come 17 to get permits and pay this fee. 18 What this item here does is largely 19 administrative. It allows the State to receive and spend the 20 funding. So this is just as projects come about, this allows 21 that to happen. 22 Again, we've got food delivery in nursing homes, 23 another emergency generator project related to food delivery. 24 So that's the legal portion of the administrators</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 for one particular site. And you'll notice on Project 8, 2 under deferred maintenance, and then Project 10 is also fire 3 alarm systems and fire suppression, meaning the sprinkler 4 systems. And these alarm systems are, you know, electronic, 5 programmable logic controllers. These things have short 6 lives, so you'll see, you know, the life span of these 7 systems, say, would be about 16 years, say, on average. And 8 so, you know, this would be a continuing need for the State. 9 Looking at our priorities, Project Number 12 here 10 is a freezer replacement and this goes to an essential 11 facility to provide food to the school systems and the needy 12 students. 13 Number 16 is an electrical issue. 14 Number 26 is our ADA program. We continue to 15 respond to Department of Justice concerns and needs of -- the 16 programmatic needs of each agency. And so those -- these are 17 addressed in this approximately \$2.5 million program. 18 Current needs at the CR Regional Center and those 19 types of facilities is that the entire facility needs to have 20 emergency power, emergency back up. And so this is a legal 21 requirement and so this project, it fulfills that requirement. 22 So we would no longer be servicing just the 23 emergency services portion of the building, it would back up 24 the entire building.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 recommendation with 2 million of other funding, 11 million of 2 state funding being recommended. 3 Looking at page 7, we see the deferred 4 maintenance for the system of higher education. This is the 5 higher education capital construction and the special higher 6 education capital construction as it relates to maintenance, 7 and this is a historic amount that's been recommended and 8 funded by the State. 9 So then throughout this -- now we'll do a little 10 more skimming here and we'll see that there will be mechanical 11 and electrical projects throughout. We'll see water projects, 12 security projects, all these high priority items. 13 You'll also see relative to the Board's 14 prioritization for the types of facilities that essential 15 facilities will be at the tops of this list, and those that 16 are institutional or governance will be at the top of those 17 essential facilities. 18 MS. STEWART: Bless you. 19 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. 20 MR. PATRICK: Moving to page 8, largely, it's 21 those same type of projects. Security, heating ventilation 22 and air conditioning. 23 Now, looking at page 9, there's water projects in 24 here. We also see Item Number 51, I draw your attention to</p>

1 that, state-wide paving. So in prior years, we've haven't
2 funded that to any great extent. And paving is one of those
3 things that if you do maintenance, it prevents having to do
4 replacements.

5 And so although this is a very large number in
6 the packet from the prior big book that we were looking at a
7 few weeks ago, you'll see this is a lot of slurry seal type
8 work to try to head off having to replace paving at a higher
9 dollar figure.

10 Now, one key item on page 10 would be Item 66,
11 appears to be a little different and -- but this is exterior
12 building repairs at the Carson City DMV. And so I point out
13 that parts of the building are all off and we've flagged
14 certain areas. And we're doing immediate repairs now under
15 offering budget items, and this is a much-needed project for
16 safety and the longevity of the project.

17 So here we are, most of the way through this
18 list, and yet there's still very -- there's just -- all these
19 are really very necessary, critical and high priority-type
20 projects.

21 On the final page of deferred maintenance, I
22 would point out that Item Number 71, when it was presented to
23 you, it was, say, a \$20 million project two weeks ago. And
24 what we've done is we've reduced that to planning the entire

1 \$20 million project, but implementing the corrective action in
2 one building.

3 And the benefit of that is if this planning takes
4 a year or more to do it, that money is not -- \$20 million is
5 not tied up for a year plus. It also -- what we've seen on
6 projects when we phase them is largely when the second phase
7 comes around, there's -- the bidder that did that first phase
8 understands the work and usually provides better pricing. So
9 when you bid a large project nobody in the construction
10 community is familiar with the pricing of it, you tend to pay
11 higher prices.

12 And that philosophy, doing planning in this CIP
13 is -- for maintenance items is fairly extensive. There are
14 four other projects in here: Domestic water at NNCC, Item 18,
15 you'll see that here as planning and we can look at that
16 quickly. So these are all fairly numerical in order. You'll
17 see that on page 7.

18 Item 18 is a planning project. So this is also
19 another one of those projects that would be north of
20 \$10 million if it -- if the corrective answer -- corrective
21 action was funded. So this is recommended to be planning in
22 this effort.

23 Also, HVAC at the DMV, which is Item Number 29 on
24 page 8. So this is somewhat of a complex project. And it

1 helps defers the cost to the next session, which you can see
2 that next session, there is likely to be many or several \$15
3 or \$20 million maintenance projects that needs to be planned
4 for.

5 And the final two projects is electrical
6 distribution at NNCC, which is Item 43 on page 9. And so,
7 again, this is a project somewhere well over \$10 million that
8 we'd be doing the planning for a year or year and a half,
9 which would enable construction to come out of the '20-'21
10 session if so approved.

11 And the final item under deferred maintenance is
12 a central plant renovation at High Desert State Prison. And
13 as we discussed in the -- on Item Number 57 on page 10. And
14 so this is -- wasn't considered this session for replacement.
15 This is part of our proactive CIP, what we talked about in the
16 last meeting is that this is a 900,000 square foot facility
17 that requires central plant system. And if this system goes
18 down, you've got 4,000 inmates that you need to, you know,
19 figure out what to do with.

20 And so this project was not requested by the
21 Department of Corrections. This is something that they've
22 adopted as a good idea due to the risks. So this would be
23 part of the beginning of proactive CIP process.

24 MR. MENICUCCI: I'm sorry, Ward, which one was

1 that? I'm a little lost.

2 MR. PATRICK: 57.

3 MR. MENICUCCI: 57. Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. PATRICK: So, Mr. Chairman, that's the
5 deferred maintenance, an overview perspective.

6 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.

7 Are there any questions of that particular
8 section? Mr. Stewart?

9 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Yeah, Sean Stewart for
10 the record. Can you go back to the graph really quick? I
11 don't want to beat a dead horse, but I just want to --

12 MEMBER BENTLEY: Is that a ranch term?

13 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Yeah. I mean, I know
14 that we talked last time about trying to figure out some
15 dedicated funding source for deferred maintenance. But I just
16 want to point out that if we don't do something soon, these
17 graphs won't even be on the same page. I mean, we're moving
18 away from each other so quickly.

19 And even if we are able to establish some
20 dedicated funding source, say, through the rental, as we have
21 talked about as a Board, proposing to see if something can be
22 done, we're still going to have to put a lot of money into
23 deferred maintenance over the next few cycles to even catch
24 up. But I just see this becoming a catastrophic issue very

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 21</p> <p>1 quickly as I look and see how fast the deferred maintenance 2 requests and the recommended are moving away from what we can 3 actually fund. 4 So I know we've talked about it. I just want to 5 mention again, we really need to look at doing something. And 6 I don't know what that avenue is. I guess I would kick that 7 back to you to recommend to us what to do, but we really need 8 to take a proactive stance in finding some long-term dedicated 9 source for deferred maintenance before the deferred 10 maintenance completely swallows us up. 11 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart. 12 Are there any other comments regarding that. 13 Mr. Patrick? 14 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 15 I would address that, as we mentioned before, the 16 Board did issue a letter to the Governor's office, and it 17 addressed this issue and talked about maintenance surcharge 18 included as rent to kind of create this other funding stream. 19 That other funding stream would mitigate 20 competition for bond money where capital projects -- you know, 21 in some later ideal world, capital projects could be funded 22 out of general obligation bonds and deferred maintenance could 23 be funded out of the surcharge or, you know, general fund 24 possibility.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 some funding for that, both for B&G and for Statewide. That 2 will be considered by the Governor's office. As I said, we've 3 had ongoing dialogue, as Ward has mentioned, and Governor's 4 chief of staff has asked for a meeting to look at that and 5 other solutions. 6 You know, the Governor's budget is confidential 7 until he releases it. So we can't say with certainty what 8 that's going to look like. But there is certainly a very 9 elevated awareness of the need and multiple proposals being 10 discussed to solve it. 11 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. 12 Are there any other questions? 13 MEMBER TIBERTI: Chairman Clutts, Tito Tiberti, 14 for the record. 15 Not a question, but I just want to endorse Sean's 16 comments and Patrick Cates. But it really is getting to be 17 20, 30 years since a lot of these big projects were built. 18 And being in this industry, I tell you, it's really becoming 19 an expensive issue, politically get involved in this Governor 20 and legislature to try to wake these people up to the fact 21 that we have to do something, whether your recommendation is 22 what it has to depend on, because we don't know how to do 23 that. But we have to push something. It's desperate. 24 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Member Tiberti.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 And so as a result of that, during the hearings 2 with the various department -- or just meetings with the 3 department heads regarding this, this was discussed with them. 4 And then also at our board meeting a couple weeks ago, the 5 Governor's chief of staff requested a meeting with Chairman 6 Clutts and Public Works Division to look at this issue. 7 And so reviewing the minutes from two years ago, 8 you know, it's anticipated -- it appeared to be anticipated by 9 the Board that, you know, we want action now, you know, two 10 years ago as related to that letter. And so it appears as 11 though there is going to be a reaction and it will likely 12 happen between now and the beginning of the session. Right. 13 And so certainly we all appreciate that comment 14 and I think that's an update that there -- some ray of hope 15 came as a result of the letter from two years ago, that there 16 is planning on being some movement in that area. 17 Thank you, Chairman. 18 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick. 19 Director Cates. 20 DIRECTOR CATES: If I could just add on to Ward's 21 comments. You know, the issue of a surcharge on B&G lease has 22 been talked about since last session with the Governor's 23 office and the Governor's office of finance. 24 We did submit, in our agency request budgets,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 Moving on to project continuations. Mr. Patrick. 2 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 3 The three projects here in project continuations, 4 and this Project 004, under deferred maintenance, this is an 5 area in the northern Nevada where it's a little cooler and 6 there's a concern that the underground heating piping may 7 fail. 8 It turns out in 2013, the Board recommended and 9 it was funded to do some investigation and some interim 10 repairs, even in the CIP, because it's a large scale-type of a 11 problem. And with the consultants and contractors on board, 12 it was determined that those issues were basically 13 sufficiently handled within that project. So that was in 2013 14 when it was funded and this work was done in the ensuing year. 15 Now, in the past year, we've seen additional 16 leaks and failures and these have been addressed. But is -- 17 based on the history, it's predicted that failure is eminent 18 and, therefore, this \$13 million is necessary to do the 19 corrective actions, do the construction project to replace 20 this underground piping. 21 Now, we -- the Public Works Division has 22 presented to the interim finance committee a proposal that 23 they adopted to do all the design now. So this project is 24 something that is going to come out of the chute after the</p>

1 session, be ready to bid and award and implement. So this
2 \$13 million is going to go right into the construction
3 activity.

4 But -- so this is -- you know, you see it's a
5 priority for -- under deferred maintenance. It's a project
6 that we're actively designing now. And only at -- we only
7 started the active design effective the October 9th BOE.

8 So, there will be a design process going after
9 Board approval through the session to enable this to be bid
10 upon financing approval, pending approval.

11 So that wasn't really a project that was funded
12 or recommended by the Board last session, but yet is in
13 design. It's a continuation of work we're actively doing.

14 Central plan renovation at NNCC, this is
15 basically a Phase 2 project. We've installed the underground
16 piping for the heating systems and this is to put -- connect
17 the boilers up to that. And so this is designed and, again,
18 ready to go out to bid at the close of the session.

19 And then finally the central plant renovation at
20 library and archives, it's in a similar condition. The design
21 is complete on this one and it will go out to bid.

22 That ends the deferred maintenance.

23 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.

24 Are there any other questions or comments

1 regarding the deferred maintenance before we have move on to
2 capital construction? Mr. Patrick.

3 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record.

4 Prioritizing criteria for capital construction is
5 presented here and we went through this in the past. Again,
6 essential facilities are at the top of the list. Other
7 facilities and then other items for consideration.

8 And so you look at this and if -- you know, if
9 there's a construction project that's mandated by law, if
10 there's a project that needs to be implemented due to life
11 safety, if we have FF&E from previously funded construction
12 projects, which there are none in this proposal, you're about
13 to see.

14 Commitments from the legislature, those will be
15 projects that were designed in a prior session and would
16 likely be funded in the 2019.

17 Prioritization of projects to own versus lease.
18 There's projects that have a large -- that are highly
19 leveraged with other funding, those have some consideration in
20 the capital area.

21 Again, if -- we've used this term, required level
22 of control, with regard to custody level. So we've got
23 facilities like Lakes Crossing that are potentially clients
24 in -- that are criminally insane, awaiting adjudication,

1 high-level security.

2 We have our maximum security prisons. Those
3 would be considered higher. And so the capital construction
4 would be prioritized based on that down to lower levels of
5 minimum security-type prisons and Health and Human Services
6 buildings.

7 Finally, level of service to the public, DMV
8 buildings have a high level of service to the public. So
9 those are considered as well as our facility condition needs
10 index. And basically, we had some dialogue on this at the
11 last meeting where, essentially, this is the expected repair
12 costs divided by the facility replacement costs.

13 And if the ratio is greater than 50 percent, it
14 should be considered to replace the building. And so we'll be
15 talking about that as we go through all these items as we go
16 through these projects.

17 At the top of our list, we have completion of
18 projects. This relates to obligations to the legislature.
19 Item Number 1 is the south Reno DMV. This was a -- I believe
20 a \$32 million project needing another 8 million --
21 \$8.6 million of highway funding.

22 The military presented the need of completion for
23 what we call the speedway readiness center and \$3.3 million
24 needed on that. The Nevada Department of Veteran's Services

1 has these two column barium-type projects, one in the north
2 and one in the south. They currently have approximately four
3 years worth of available space for their needs, and that is
4 about the time where we start obtaining these grants and
5 moving ahead with these improvements to those two cemeteries.

6 These -- as was pointed out in our prior meeting,
7 these grants have never been denied. And so we consider this
8 request for funding pretty solid, for the other funding and
9 the state funding is for project management inspection fees to
10 manage these projects from the State Public Works Division.

11 Additionally, we have the Fleet Services
12 building. Robby Burgess discussed this as the administrator
13 of Fleet Services.

14 This project has been designed and is ready to go
15 to construction. We have the advanced planning program, this
16 is our effort to provide that review of that -- all those
17 requests and continue the proactive CIP.

18 The Grant Sawyer office building is a project
19 that you heard that included a request for \$55 million. And
20 so that is a project where we went to the legislator --
21 legislature and we discussed this two weeks ago. We went to
22 the legislature and we got approval to do engineering systems
23 investigation and we got approval to do an architectural
24 analysis.

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 And so the engineering systems evaluation is 2 where we're going to be looking at all the various piping 3 systems, look at all the various ventilation systems and just 4 all engineering systems. 5 And then that's going to feed an architectural 6 evaluation to determine if we -- and I call this the three 7 R's: Whether we repair the building for this \$55 million, 8 whether we replace this building, repair -- remodel, excuse 9 me. 10 So the second item would be remodel, say, at 11 maybe \$400 per square foot or whether we would replace it, 12 which might be in the order of a magnitude of \$600 a square 13 foot for perspective on that. 14 And so that study is intended to happen pretty 15 quickly and be started -- initiated by the Board of Examiners 16 approval for the contract on October 9th. And we'd be looking 17 to likely not have information for Governor's recommendation, 18 and so we'll need to work through that. 19 Again, the intent here is this is the -- if lease 20 purchase is chosen for the third option of replace, this would 21 be the worst-case scenario number for request for State 22 funding. 23 So this would be the anticipated remodel costs 24 for planning. And so we anticipate this design effort to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 implications besides only the Sawyer building. I apologize 2 for that. I was using that more as a point of reference. 3 There are other structures in the Las Vegas area, the Belrose 4 building, for instance. We talked about this facility 5 condition needs index and that building has a needs index 6 we'll say of 75 percent. 7 Reviewing all the projects in the CIP that are 8 needed for the Belrose building, and adding those nonredundant 9 needs from the facility condition analysis, say that building 10 needs \$15 million of repair in the next five years. 11 And so replacement of that 40,000 square foot 12 building might be in the order magnitude cost of, say, 13 20 million and thus the 75 percent ratio. 14 So this project here would enable us, enable the 15 State to not do the \$15 million of repair for that small 16 building and might enable some sort of phasing that would help 17 the Sawyer building. If repairs were done in phases, we could 18 move people from the Sawyer building and repair the Sawyer 19 building in phases. 20 So these are building blocks, not necessarily 21 ultimate solutions for all problems in southern Nevada. 22 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. Bryce Clutts, 23 for the record again. 24 Can you clarify, though -- I must have missed</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 incur in the 2019 session, and then any full construction 2 would come out of the 2021 CIP. 3 So I'd like to reiterate that, that we believe 4 that, again, the three R's. Repair costs in this session 5 would be in the order magnitude of 5 or 6 million to design 6 those after the study is done. 7 Remodel, which is this number, to do the design 8 would be approximately \$8 million for the Sawyer building. 9 And if you look down further on the list, Item 10 Number 9, designing a new building that could ultimately be a 11 lease purchase, would be -- 7 million would be less. 12 And so there's other considerations on Item 13 Number 9 and we'll get to those. But I was curious -- so I 14 would pause for any questions on the Sawyer building. 15 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Mr. Patrick, Bryce Clutts 16 for the record. 17 So if it's \$8 million to design and remodel that 18 building, if I'm understanding right, it's \$7 million to build 19 a new building with state funding and \$79 million comes from 20 other funding. 21 Can you remind me where the other funding comes 22 from and why that wouldn't be a higher priority given that 23 it's a less state funding? 24 MR. PATRICK: Yeah, this Item Number 9 has other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 something before -- on where the 79 million and other funding 2 comes from? 3 MR. PATRICK: Okay. Sorry about that. 4 Yeah, so -- and I haven't really presented this 5 item. We're still on Item 7. But on Item -- jumping to 6 Item 9, this is seen as a possible lease purchase project. 7 And so it's possible that we talked about in -- we talked 8 about doing a maintenance -- deferred maintenance surcharge. 9 And so that would be where many buildings are contributing to 10 the overall pot of deferred maintenance needs or funding. 11 And it's possible that the funding stream on this 12 could be each buildings and grounds facility could contribute 13 what I would call a capital surcharge that would be the 14 dedicated funding stream to pay off the lease purchase 15 payments. And so this, the funding stream for the 79 million 16 would -- there's one option, is that that could be capital 17 surcharge. 18 In the last session, we had the UNR engineering 19 building was recommended by the Board at \$41.5 million of 20 state money and \$41.5 million of UNR funding. And during the 21 course of the Governor's recommendation in the legislature, 22 that project was lease purchased and the dedicated funding 23 stream was general fund. 24 And so the funding stream for this project is not</p>

1 necessarily fully determined at the -- we'll call this the
2 agency recommendation, the administrators recommendation
3 stage, but there are options that keep this -- there are
4 options for funding that keep this a very feasible and
5 recommendable project.

6 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.
7 Bryce Clutts, for the record.

8 Just another question. I'm just trying to just
9 get my head wrapped around this. If this state office
10 building referenced in CAP 009 was constructed, would it house
11 all state offices that are currently in southern Nevada?

12 MR. PATRICK: So this -- no, it will not.

13 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Okay.

14 MR. PATRICK: This is foreseen here as 100,000
15 square foot building.

16 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. PATRICK: So the -- so for perspective, the
18 Sawyer building is 224,000 square feet. The Belrose building
19 is 40,000. And so there's other buildings that are not in the
20 eye of possible removal from the inventory that will be a
21 larger square footage.

22 DIRECTOR CATES: Director Cates.

23 And how much leased square footage do we have in
24 Las Vegas, private lease?

1 be on the continuation list for capital projects.

2 Project Number 9, the State office building,
3 again, the lease purchased project. This was seen as -- a
4 preferred delivery method would likely be a construction
5 manager at risk type of procurement method.

6 And this is basically requesting for this 100,000
7 square foot proposal requesting \$80 million of authority to do
8 a lease purchase and \$7 million for the construction manager
9 at risk with the architectural design through construction
10 documents and planning.

11 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Mr. Patrick, Bryce Clutts,
12 for the record.

13 Since you brought it up, I'll address it. Can
14 you help clarify why in this particular regard with the ground
15 up building, with all intents and purposes, limited
16 complications, that that delivery method would be the one
17 chosen?

18 MR. PATRICK: Well, I would say that there's --
19 it's a time of uncertainty now where inflation in southern
20 Nevada could be 10 percent, could be 12, could be 14. And so
21 this provides us information directly during the design
22 process from the construction community.

23 Now, I believe Mr. Nunez has testified in the
24 past that an office building would not offer that complexity

1 MR. PATRICK: I didn't bring -- I had that at the
2 prior meeting. I didn't bring that here.

3 DIRECTOR CATES: Substantially more than 100,000?

4 MR. PATRICK: Lease square footage, I think, is
5 in the order magnitude of, yes, we'll say around a million
6 square feet. 700, a million -- 700,000, a million square
7 feet, in that area.

8 DIRECTOR CATES: So there's ample demand for
9 office space down there to occupy this building and then some
10 by a long shot.

11 MR. PATRICK: Yeah.

12 Continuing, we're talking about Item 7, moving to
13 Item 8, the heavy equipment shop and renovation in Elko. So
14 this is an advance planning project.

15 The Nevada Division of for Forestry responds to
16 all the fires, all the wildland fires, and this is an advance
17 planning project to enable their shop to be -- their old shop
18 to be renovated and a new shop to be built that can handle the
19 new -- the larger equipment they have.

20 And so their larger equipment doesn't fit in
21 their small shop and they would need to work on equipment in
22 the winter, doing preventative maintenance in -- you know, in
23 the snow and mud in front of the building. So this is an
24 advance planning project. So, again, we would expect this to

1 warranting CMAR. But due to the pricing type of fluctuations
2 and uncertainties in southern Nevada, I'm recommending this to
3 be CMAR.

4 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you.

5 MR. PATRICK: Item 10 here, advance planning
6 headquarters Depart of Public Safety. This project, we had a
7 small error in our presentation. It was during the prior
8 meeting and we had some -- so since then, this project has
9 been reduced in size. We had a 300 -- a couple hundred
10 thousand dollar error in that, and that has since been
11 reduced.

12 And so this is a project -- to kick off a project
13 that's been requested by the Department for many years and
14 it's just to kind of start the process, do engineering
15 evaluations and land selection.

16 Capital Project Number 11 is a security fence
17 upgrade at Three Lakes Valley conservation camp. And as the
18 director testified, this would enable higher custody level
19 inmates to be housed in what are now minimum security area of
20 this Three Lakes valley conservation camp. So this level of
21 funding here mitigates building a whole new housing unit by
22 just building a double fence and sally ports.

23 Marlette Dam, Marlette Lake water system, the
24 State has been -- so you'll -- you've seen in the requests

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 from the agency that there was upwards of \$62 million 2 requested in the current -- in what we saw two weeks ago. And 3 so we're pursuing a Federal Emergency Management Act grant 4 of -- that would provide \$10 million toward renovating the 5 dam, itself, at Marlette. 6 And we've had FEMA out at the site and we believe 7 there's a pretty good opportunity here to obtain that funding 8 and fix the dam, which is -- there's different types of dam 9 ratings on different dams. And so I think it's moderate, low, 10 significant and high type of safety concerns. 11 And this Marlette Dam has a list of 12 recommendations from the safety people at our department here 13 at the State, conservation of natural resources, and this 14 project here utilizes the \$10 million from FEMA and provides a 15 25 percent match. 16 So in this case, 25 percent would be \$3.3 million 17 and we've added Public Works management inspection fee of 18 approximately \$400,000 to that to enable this project to come 19 to fruition. 20 The next project, and I believe there's a series 21 of projects. A couple projects here relate to security, 22 security at the Attorney General's office and security at 23 Desert Regional Center, building number 1391. 24 A larger project on the next page, 15, is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 the prison system, which could mitigate some of these other 2 housing needs in, say, a ten-year plan. 3 One of the most awesome projects on this list is 4 the Knowledge and Innovations Center for the Nevada State 5 Library and Archives. This is a -- this is a building that 6 is, I think, built in 1989. So it's 28 years old and would 7 create a focal point in the capital complex to allow training 8 to be completed and collaborative decision making and attract 9 higher and higher caliber employees to the State's -- to the 10 State's system of some 15,000 employees. And so this is 11 50 percent funded with other funding and 50 percent funded 12 with state funding. 13 Item 20 is a storage facility addition at Indian 14 Hills Curatorial Center. This is a project that comes with 15 other funding. We've had a federal -- a federal bit of 16 funding. And this is a priority one project for the 17 Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. 18 The Reno Sparks Live Stock Event Center master 19 plan. Here's a \$2.3 million project, which it's requested a 20 million and a half dollars of state funding. 21 The -- a building demolition project. This is a 22 safety concern up in Sparks off of Galetti Way. There's three 23 buildings there, wooden structures. If we wait much longer, 24 there will -- we'll have to -- we won't be able to see over</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 housing expansion at Southern Desert Correctional Center. 2 This was, I believe, the number one priority of the Nevada 3 Department of Corrections. You'll note that in the prior 4 proposal that you saw two weeks ago, the estimated cost was 5 approximately 88 million. We received updated cost estimates 6 and we conducted inquiries into the external environment here 7 at what prisons are going for. 8 And our recommendation -- my recommendation is 9 that this is \$108 million task. This includes two housing 10 units, this includes a lagoon system upgrade, includes other 11 sewerage upgrades and central plans to support that building. 12 Next project is advanced planning for Northern 13 Nevada Correctional Center housing unit and core expansion. 14 This was presented at the prior meeting. This would be a 15 subsequent need to cover the needs of an expanding inmate 16 population based on James F. Austin projections that were 17 discussed by the director. 18 Item 17 is a number -- another lobby project and 19 security for Department of Education here in Carson City. 20 Item 18 is the heavy equipment simulator 21 classrooms. This is a project that the Department of 22 Employment Training Rehabilitation is offering a grant of 23 \$225,000, which goes to the Department of Corrections' ability 24 to prevent recidivism, to prevent inmates from returning to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 the top of these, but they'll still create an area of concern. 2 They're falling down basically on their own, but still there 3 need to be some mop up work. Regardless, this project is much 4 needed. 5 And the final item under capital construction is 6 the Nevada State College education academic building. As you 7 heard under public comment, the reference to the \$6 million of 8 funding commitments and the \$55 million of state funding here. 9 That concludes the recommendation regarding 10 capital construction. We've yet to hear historic 11 preservation. 12 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick. 13 Are there any questions or comments regarding the 14 capital construction? 15 Member Hand. 16 MEMBER HAND: Member Hand, for the record. 17 I'm just curious that a lot of these are planning 18 projects. And do you have a sense of what the total planning 19 versus -- or what percentage of the total budget is for 20 planning? And is there some number or some percentage that's 21 a right number and a percentage that's a wrong number? 22 It seems like I'm hearing a lot of planning, 23 planning, planning, and that's just more deferred costs with 24 inflation. And it, you know, just is sort of piling on what</p>

1 Shawn had to say earlier.
2 MR. PATRICK: Yes. Regarding how much planning
3 we have here, under capital construction, there's \$14 million
4 of planning recommended for the State and that's not in your
5 packet. That's in case you asked that question.
6 MEMBER HAND: Okay. Okay. You had that answer.
7 MR. PATRICK: And so there's a total of
8 \$15.8 million of which 1 million was from other sources.
9 And so I can go through -- and in addition for
10 deferred maintenance, there was approximately \$5 million of
11 total funding. So the total would be \$20 million of planning.
12 And so regarding what is the right number on a
13 ratio basis of the available funding, certainly these deferred
14 maintenance projects are priority one, priority one. And
15 priority one is an area where in the -- in the past two
16 bienniums, we've been splitting priority one projects and
17 recommending priority 1A projects, which are considered
18 critical and the priority. Priority one and they're critical.
19 And so all of these projects that we're talking about today,
20 we're putting them as category of 1A, these are all critical.
21 And so to answer your question regarding what is
22 the right percentage of the money we have in order to, you
23 know, not just create plans to put on the shelf, deferred
24 maintenance items, they're going to -- they're seen as kind of

1 a must do. So I would remove that from the equation of
2 percentage of how much planning should you do.
3 And so then -- so then looking at this planning
4 effort for capital construction, so then here, we're looking
5 at \$16 million worth of planning. It's believed that the
6 Livestock Center will potentially be funded with non-state
7 funding. So it's -- I think this project is seen as kind of a
8 booster shot for that project. And so that would probably not
9 fall into the category of this is an ensuing state obligation.
10 And then there's planning in here for
11 corrections, which are necessary projects, you know, it's
12 essential facilities. We have -- you know, it takes a number
13 of boxes on our funding capital requirements.
14 And then we've got the Grant Sawyer Building,
15 which is the lion's share of that as one project, it's
16 \$8 million. And so that is considered a very high need. And
17 so just as a percentage basis, we've now reduced other
18 projects -- oh, and so then there's \$2 million to just do work
19 here at Public Works for planning to provide this effort.
20 So now we're looking at only a couple other
21 projects that we're recommending planning for, which would be
22 the Division of Forestry equipment shop and the public safety
23 project. And there -- so that ratio is basically --
24 DIRECTOR CATES: Grant Sawyer.

1 MR. PATRICK: -- very minor, and I think -- bless
2 you. Not to avoid what is the right ratio, but just to kind
3 of walk through those projects that they all be justified.
4 MEMBER HAND: Maybe the -- Member Hand, for the
5 record again.
6 Maybe the follow-up to that is: How much does
7 that kick the can down the road in terms of dollars?
8 MR. PATRICK: Right.
9 MEMBER HAND: That would probably be a better
10 question.
11 MR. PATRICK: Okay. And I hear that. I would
12 say under deferred maintenance, this could be \$70 million.
13 And under construction, I would remove the livestock events
14 center and these other items could be in over \$200 million.
15 MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, for the record, if I
16 could interject.
17 One of the things to keep in mind is NRS 341.083
18 does give guidance on this. The recommendation that the Board
19 makes to the Governor must, to the extent practical, provide
20 that each project which exceeds a cost of \$10 million be
21 scheduled to receive funding for design and planning during
22 one biennium and funding for construction in the subsequent
23 biennium.
24 So there is some guidance in the statute as far

1 as the planning and construction from one biennium to the
2 next, just as a point of it's in the law.
3 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.
4 Any other questions on that before we move on?
5 MEMBER HAND: No.
6 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Director Cates?
7 DIRECTOR CATES: I just want to echo Member
8 Hand's kind of questions and concerns. It seems like we're
9 setting up a lot of expectations for future legislature that
10 they won't be able to fulfill.
11 You know, the public safety headquarters
12 building, they had a great presentation, they had good
13 justification. They've been asking for a long time. But
14 that's, you know, going to be \$100,000 plus or \$100 million
15 plus project, I'm sure.
16 And something that's not even on that list --
17 this list that's important to keep in mind is in addition to
18 the education building, the legislature approved two
19 additional funding projects for very large projects for NSHE
20 that would -- I mean, if you add that in with the public
21 safety building, Grant Sawyer and all these other things,
22 you're going to have an expectation and we'll have expended a
23 lot of money on advance planning. And there's not -- you can
24 wait until the 2021 session, there's still not going to be

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 anywhere near enough money to do these projects. 2 And I think it's especially concerning on new 3 construction when you look at the chart about the maintenance. 4 I get the advanced planning for some of the maintenance 5 projects, but I'm just concerned that we're setting false 6 expectations that we won't be able to fund in future years. 7 MEMBER HAND: Member Hand, for the record. 8 And so it negates the question: Why wouldn't 9 some of that planning money be used for deferred maintenance 10 rather than spending it all on planning? 11 I'm looking at Patrick, not you. I'm sorry. 12 MR. PATRICK: Yeah, and I would point out that 13 this headquarters building is partially funded with other 14 funds from, I believe, the highway fund or emissions control. 15 And this is to enable the studies to be done and the site 16 selection. This is not even to the schematic design level. 17 So this would be assuring where that building might go and 18 what are the implications. 19 So it would still be down the road. I tell -- I 20 tell the various department stories about a particular project 21 that the Public Works board then, now -- or Public Works board 22 approved in the past was is a Department of Agricultural 23 building. 24 And so 22 years ago, I got here and they had</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 Governor's office, we talked about what is the deferred -- you 2 know, why shouldn't this funding go to the deferred 3 maintenance. 4 So in that letter, again, we talked about how the 5 Board recommended 114 million and that was what was funded, 6 and it also referred to requesting a 141 million in the 2019 7 CIP. And so Susan mentioned to me here that I didn't give a 8 total for deferred maintenance, but the total deferred 9 maintenance is in order magnitude of 146 million. So it's 10 north of the request. You'd have to skip ahead to the sub 11 totals, yeah, on page 19? 12 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: 18. 13 MR. PATRICK: 18. 14 And so totaling up these three figures on 15 page 18, you'd see 13 million, 109 million and 23 million, 16 which is approximately 146 million. 17 So we're north of our request last time. We do 18 only have the 1A projects. If -- we would strongly encourage 19 the -- you know, the prioritized list that's in your board 20 packet to go beyond the 1A projects. This is just a one cut, 21 that recommendation. 22 So moving onto historic preservation, 23 Mr. Chairman? 24 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Please.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 requested this project 2, 3, 4 sessions and they got nothing. 2 And we said, why don't you start by doing engineering studies, 3 site development studies and analysis and programming. And so 4 this project here for DPS is very similar. 5 Then the next session, the Department of 6 Agricultural came and said, okay, now we want our building. 7 And I would say, why don't we do schematic design? And so 8 that is 15 percent, say, of the whole AE fee. So it's another 9 small step, moving the project ahead, but you're developing 10 your programmatic needs. Sometimes things get wrapped around 11 the axle during schematic design. So then, again, they would 12 come the next session and ask for the whole building again. 13 And I said, why don't we do construction documents. 14 So the intent here is to walk through a planning 15 process that enables them to be funded down the road, and so 16 not necessarily to rush through to get construction documents 17 and have somebody, you know, sitting here at this meeting in 18 public comment and say, where is that public safety building. 19 The idea is just to develop the concept of where 20 it's going to go and keep the project alive and when -- you 21 know, prior planning prevents poor performance. And so this 22 is just a little sliver of what that \$100 million would need. 23 And so getting back to the letter that the 24 Board -- the Board authored with staff's help to the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 MR. PATRICK: So we have -- we have the 2 prioritizing criteria here and that's been reviewed -- 3 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Mr. Chairman. 4 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Mr. Stewart. 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: I did have a question 6 on these, as well. But we can come back; is that better? Get 7 through the historic preservation and then do it at the end or 8 what do you prefer? Sean Stewart, for the record. 9 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: I would prefer if you've got 10 a question on capital construction, let her rip. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Okay. In fact, I've 12 got three. I apologize. But I'll try to go quick. 13 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Fair enough. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Director -- I had 15 four, but Director Cates took care of one of them. We won't 16 repeat that one. 17 On CAP 15, you said that there were two 18 central -- or two units, housing units from that. Can you 19 just remind me how many beds are in a housing unit? 20 MR. PATRICK: Yeah, each housing unit has 168 21 cells, which is 336 beds. 22 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Okay. Okay. Perfect. 23 And then I was just going to reiterate on CAP 19, 24 I'm excited to see that there. Obviously, a great project. I</p>

1 really like the 50/50 match that's there.

2 Along those same lines, I'm a little concerned
3 that we don't have one project on here that I thought was
4 important, if I can mention that project? It was the UNLV
5 engineering building that was brought up. I was really kind
6 of shocked at how fast that department is growing and I
7 remember they had proposed a 50/50 match, as well.

8 My concern is: If we don't at least get into
9 planning this cycle, we're looking at six years before they'd
10 have an engineering building. And the way that department was
11 growing, the statistics they showed us, that could be very
12 detrimental to the expansion down in the University.

13 But anyway, I just wanted to bring that up. I
14 hadn't seen that on this sheet.

15 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record.

16 Regarding Nevada System of Higher Education, the
17 Public Works Division has been honoring the priorities of the
18 Board of Regents. And I believe that engineering project was
19 the third priority on the Board of Regents list and the
20 project here, Nevada state college education building, is
21 their first priority.

22 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Sean Stewart, for the
23 record.

24 I understand that and I do think this is a very

1 medical building?

2 MEMBER TIBERTI: Yes, sir.

3 MR. PATRICK: The UNLV medical building was
4 funded out of SB-553 for \$50 million. The University system
5 has a request that we're -- Public Works division is going arm
6 in arm with to the next interim legislative committee to allow
7 that project to advance.

8 It's basically been on hold. And so we're --
9 active request going to the October 24th legislative finance
10 committee would help that project move ahead and start going.

11 And so that project was initially, we'll say, one
12 big project awaiting significant donor money, and that big
13 project was approximately 220,000 square feet. We're looking
14 for the project that could potentially advance on
15 October 24th. It would be in order magnitude size of 49 or
16 50,000 square feet and be approximately a \$60 million project
17 if the legislative committee endorses that request.

18 MEMBER TIBERTI: If I may, as a follow-up, Ward?

19 They were asking me: Where did this library
20 medical facility come out of the other building? I said I had
21 never heard of that until she called me. So I muddled up
22 on -- is this called a library medical building now instead of
23 the -- I mean, where is all that coming from?

24 MR. PATRICK: Yes, yes, the current request is

1 noble -- I'm not saying, by any means, we should remove
2 CAP-23. My concern is, is when we -- we also have to look at
3 our overall funding, right? And when we have a project that
4 comes forward that's a 50/50 match, in my opinion, that grabs
5 my attention, that if they're willing to go in that far, there
6 may be a more need than is being mentioned.

7 And I also understand that NSHE comes up with
8 their priority list. But for the record, I just wanted to
9 mention that I think with a 50/50 match, it's something we
10 should consider.

11 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Stewart.

12 Are there any other questions?

13 Mr. Tiberti.

14 MEMBER TIBERTI: Chairman -- Tito Tiberti, for
15 the record, Tito Tiberti.

16 Since we're in this vein, I am curious where this
17 medical building is. I've had two reporters call me in the
18 last two weeks, asking me about this bifurcated building and
19 what happened to it.

20 And then there was an article today in the Las
21 Vegas Sun, and I really haven't read it that closely. But I'm
22 just curious, since we're in discussion, you know, where is
23 all that in the whole process?

24 MR. PATRICK: If you're referring to the UNLV

1 for the program to largely be a library component, and so the
2 220,000 square foot building had a library component. And so
3 this -- to add a little -- in an attempt to not overstep my
4 bounds too far, the current medical school is approximately 60
5 students, but yet they have nursing and dental students that
6 would also benefit from the library that was going to be a
7 part of the 220,000 square foot building.

8 So the 60 students that are in the medical school
9 will benefit from that library as well as the dental and the
10 nursing schools. And that's, I think, the genesis of why that
11 would be a good first phase.

12 MEMBER TIBERTI: Clear as mud. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Director Cates.

14 DIRECTOR CATES: Yeah, if I could just add on to
15 that a little bit some of my understanding.

16 UNLV went back on their own, Public Works wasn't
17 really involved in it, to try to figure out a new scope that
18 they could come forward with. And so they came forward with
19 the library to use the existing funding. And to get to
20 60 million, there's about another 10 million or so that they
21 would have to come up with in donations, which they've
22 committed to do.

23 What they've indicated to us is that the larger
24 project for the rest of the medical school, that they were

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 going to continue to pursue private funding for that and did 2 not anticipate asking any public funds for that. Still muddy? 3 MEMBER TIBERTI: Thank you. 4 MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman. 5 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Please. 6 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 7 Regarding historic preservation, on page 17, we 8 have four projects here. These are, again, all in the 1A 9 priority projects that are critical. 10 Building seismic stabilization of the old 11 gymnasium at the Stewart facility. Now, this is basically a 12 continuation project. We've -- the State has acquired funding 13 to do the planning for renovating the roof and seismically 14 stabilize the roof. 15 The State has provided funding in the 17 CIP to 16 construct that seismic stabilization and that barrier on the 17 roof, and now the intent here is to make the building usable 18 for this \$11 million item. 19 Related to the -- out at the Stewart facility, we 20 have building 19. And in the current -- in the current CIP, 21 we have a project to enable a welcome center and a cultural 22 center to be completed, which would have displays and 23 artifacts. And as those artifacts rotate through that 24 cultural center, some of the storage is planned to occur in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 this is a planning level project, to just kind of scope that 2 out. 3 And, again, another planning project is the 4 Heroes Memorial building and annex. And so this is a seismic 5 retrofit project. There are two buildings left on the capital 6 complex that have seismic needs. The other being the -- what 7 we call the old armory building where some of our employees 8 are in there with our buildings and grounds division. We have 9 shops over there. And a seismic renovation is one of the 10 priorities for safety of the Board, and this project is on 11 here to enable it to advance in the next session for funding. 12 One last note on this project. It turns out 13 there are two sister buildings on that block for the Attorney 14 General's office. We renovated one of them for seismic 15 retrofit, we'll say over ten years ago, and then this one had 16 not -- this other one listed here has not been renovated and 17 it's probably time to ensure safety of the state employees. 18 And that concludes the historic preservation. 19 Going to the next page, Item 18 -- 20 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Before we do that, Bryce 21 Clutts, for the record. 22 While it's fresh on my mind, one of the things 23 that we continue to talk about is funding. But the thing we 24 don't talk about, which is often not talked about in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 this building 19. So you see this million dollar renovation 2 project, building 19. 3 The Nevada Indian Commission, with the support of 4 Public Works and our consultants, has developed a master plan 5 for the Stewart facility and this building 19 in the short 6 term is seen as a storage facility, but would later be used 7 for other purposes, and thus, we believe that warrants seismic 8 upgrades because it will eventually be more of an occupied 9 building than a storage building. 10 Item 3 is advance planning for envelope 11 protection for the Spring Mountain Ranch State Park. And so 12 state parks has, again, been coming to the Division, asking 13 for a series of buildings at the Spring Mountain Ranch State 14 Park to be upgraded, the entire envelope and the, we'll say, 15 approximately ten buildings. 16 And we've -- I've expressed the concern that you 17 come to us and you ask for a project six sessions in a row and 18 you don't get any funding, maybe we should plan it out and -- 19 you know, plan it out and develop a plan that we can work to, 20 develop a path. 21 So this is a small amount of money to develop a 22 path of how we might approach this complex project because 23 there's a series of buildings built from the 1800's through 24 the mid-1900's that all have varying types of needs. And so</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 government, is how to reduce costs. And I have to say after 2 sitting through now my third biennium, I'm amazed by how 3 expensive these projects are becoming with the limited amount 4 of resources that we have. You know, for example, the fact 5 that it cost \$8.5 million to build a metal fleet services 6 building just strikes me as odd. 7 You were talking about \$80 million office 8 buildings, hundred-plus million dollar prisons, you know, 9 \$26 million remodels of existing buildings. I just -- I think 10 we need to look at ways in which we can control the design, 11 the engineering, the scope. I don't know what it is, you 12 know, I'm going to go on record again, but the fact that I 13 don't believe that the CMAR method, particularly in the 14 limited amount of competition that exists within this state 15 alone, is necessarily the right approach to some of these very 16 limited complexity-type projects. 17 We need to figure out ways in which to control 18 the spending and not just look at this as a funding issue. I 19 think we also have a spending issue. 20 So before we get into the fact that, you know, 21 we're talking about, you know, \$500 million of work, I just 22 want to say that I'd like to see us, as we move forward, start 23 to looks at how we can control some of this because I 24 understand there's an inflationary issue within this</p>

1 particular state. That same issue exists across the country.
2 But inflation, as a whole, has remained
3 relatively stable. And so I get where you're coming from, but
4 I don't -- I don't believe that's our primary issue. I
5 believe that the design and the spending is just out of
6 control. So I leave it at that.

7 So, moving on to the priority summary.

8 MR. PATRICK: We discussed -- Ward Patrick, for
9 the record.

10 We discussed the first three items on here,
11 deferred maintenance, that the total is basically \$146 million
12 of deferred maintenance. And the capital construction is
13 136 million of other funding and \$211 million of state
14 funding. And historic reservation is requesting \$14 million.

15 So, therefore, the total recommendation by the
16 administrator is \$152 million of other funding, \$355 million
17 of state funding for a total of 507 million. And I would
18 offer that these are considered the 1A projects, these are
19 high priority and critical.

20 I would offer that it appears as though the
21 letter that the Board had sent to the Governor's office is
22 going to be effective in allocating maintenance funding -- for
23 maintenance funding and that the economy is likely supporting
24 bond funding greater than the \$110 or \$120 million amount that

1 MS. STEWART: No, you go ahead.

2 MR. PATRICK: So this is a possible action
3 item --

4 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Bryce Clutts, for the
5 record.

6 Ms. Stewart, can you clarify exactly what we need
7 to do here?

8 MS. STEWART: Yes. For the record, Susan
9 Stewart, construction law counsel.

10 At this point, the administrator has made his
11 recommendation to the Board for the Board's recommendation to
12 the Governor.

13 And as you'll see in the action item to be
14 developed by the Board, your options are, of course, to accept
15 the administrator's recommendation as presented, to -- or to
16 suggest revisions to the administrator's recommendation and
17 then that would be accepted as the Board's recommendation to
18 the Governor.

19 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart.

20 I have a question regarding that recommendations.

21 Do those, for -- I'll give an example: If there were -- based
22 on today's meeting, if there were -- and further review beyond
23 this meeting, recommendations to be provided, could those
24 recommendations be done outside of this board to the

1 we discussed at the treasurer's office as offered to state
2 government that it would be in that order of magnitude.

3 And with that, I'd like to draw some perspective
4 to the method of which the staff and the Board is, one,
5 provides the recommendations to the Governor's office last
6 session and even prior sessions.

7 And last session, the economic conditions were
8 worse then than they are now regarding the projections for
9 funding for bonding and regarding any hope that capital
10 funding and deferred maintenance would come from separate
11 funding sources.

12 And so the total last session was approximately
13 300 million was what was recommended by the Board to the
14 Governor's office. And so we're -- you know, we're more
15 optimistic now at 500 million.

16 Further, the needs don't go down, but this
17 inflation area impact is very, very real. And so there's some
18 of that impact between, say, 300 and 500 million. And with
19 that, I would stand for any other questions.

20 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Mr. Patrick.

21 Are there any further questions?

22 Hearing none, we'll move onto Agenda Item
23 Number 4.

24 MR. PATRICK: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

1 administrator to then be presented at a future meeting?

2 MS. STEWART: Susan Stewart, for the record.

3 You could handle that a couple different ways.

4 You could, at this meeting, make revisions to the
5 administrator's recommendation. The administrator would
6 follow up with those.

7 The Board could, at this meeting, say, make those
8 changes and that would be the Board's recommendation; or
9 depending on the complexity issues, recommendations, changes,
10 you may want to have a subsequent meeting, but you don't
11 necessarily need to.

12 As I recall last session when we -- leading up to
13 last session when we were preparing this, the Board made
14 recommendations or made changes to the administrator's
15 recommendations, those were incorporated and then they went to
16 the Governor's office.

17 So it really is at the Board's pleasure, but a
18 second meeting or a subsequent meeting is not necessary.

19 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. Okay. So I
20 guess I'll open it up to the Board for questions and comments
21 regarding that or if you're prepared to make a motion, I'll
22 entertain one.

23 MEMBER TIBERTI: What motion are you looking for?

24 Tito Tiberti, for the record.

September 6, 2018

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Member Tiberti, Bryce 2 Clutts, for the record. 3 A motion to accept the administrator's 4 recommendations as presented or -- 5 MEMBER TIBERTI: So moved. So moved as you 6 stated. 7 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Is there a second? 8 VICE CHAIRPERSON STEWART: Second. 9 Sean Stewart, for the record. 10 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: All those in favor? 11 Any opposed? 12 Hearing none, the Administrator's recommendations 13 have been approved. 14 (Motion carried.) 15 MS. STEWART: For the record, Susan Stewart. 16 Then that will be the -- be translated into the 17 Board's recommendations to the Governor. 18 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart. 19 MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman? 20 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Mr. Patrick. 21 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 22 So we'll develop the cover letter and the package 23 for the Governor's office and submit it for your review. 24 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 63</p> <p>1 I do have one that I would like to see at a 2 future meeting. And that would be, Mr. Patrick, if we could 3 get an analysis of the projects over the last three bienniums 4 that exceed \$10 million and what the delivery method of that 5 project was -- those projects were, what the original State 6 Public Works Division budget was and what the final costs of 7 those projects were. I would appreciate it. 8 MR. PATRICK: Ward Patrick, for the record. 9 That will be provided. 10 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you. 11 MS. STEWART: May I just add something also? 12 Susan Stewart, again, for the record. 13 I just wanted to throw out not necessarily a 14 recommendation or anything, but some of the issues that have 15 come up today are kind of reoccurring. 16 One of the things that the Board has done in the 17 past is they created subcommittees. They had a legislative 18 subcommittee in the past. There's issues with, you know, 19 cost, deferred maintenance and I just throw that out as an 20 avenue that's available to the Board. 21 It allows a little bit of flexibility. You know, 22 obviously there's still public meetings, but that is something 23 that is an avenue for the Board to use to drill down on some 24 of these issues.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 62</p> <p>1 Okay. Now, moving onto Agenda Item Number 4 for 2 possible action, board comments and discussion. 3 Are there any board comments on any agenda item? 4 MS. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I did have one 5 comment relevant to Agenda Item Number 4. 6 I did want to point out that we had reserved 7 September 13th as a possible follow-up meeting date for 8 finalizing the CIP recommendation. Based upon the Board's 9 vote today, that will not be necessary. 10 However, we have, because this date has been 11 reserved by the Board, an appeal hearing with Granite 12 construction is now scheduled for September 13th. And I 13 believe you-all got an e-mail advising you that that was going 14 to take place. 15 So you do need to keep September 13th at 16 9:00 a.m. on your calendar for the appeal hearing and that 17 will be video-conferenced, and I anticipate the meeting would 18 be no more than 45 minutes. So you can schedule your time as 19 necessary. 20 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart. 21 Moving onto Item Number 2 there. Items to be 22 included in future agendas, are there any items to be included 23 in future agendas? 24 Bryce Clutts, for the record.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 64</p> <p>1 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Thank you, Ms. Stewart. 2 And I would -- I would definitely recommend that. 3 Whatever the most efficient way is to drill down as opposed to 4 doing it in this forum, whatever options we have there, I'm 5 open to that. 6 MS. STEWART: For the record, Susan Stewart. 7 Perhaps with the -- included in the next agenda, 8 we could outline some of those options that are available to 9 the Board. And since I've thrown it out there, then we can 10 get a flavor for what the Board's position is on that. 11 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Perfect. Thank you. 12 MS. STEWART: Uh-huh. 13 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Okay. Moving onto Agenda 14 Item Number 5, public comment. 15 Is there any public comment? 16 MEMBER BENTLEY: None. 17 CHAIRPERSON CLUTTS: Hearing none, we'll move 18 onto Agenda Item Number 6, adjournment. 19 This meeting is adjourned. 20 (Proceedings concluded at 10:37 a.m.) 21 22 23 24</p>

1 STATE OF NEVADA,)
2 CARSON CITY.) ss.

3

4 I, Michel Loomis, Certified Court Reporter #228, do
5 hereby certify:

6 That on September 6, 2018, at 515 East Musser
7 Street, Suite 102, Carson City, Nevada, I was present and took
8 stenotype notes of the public hearing held before the Public
9 Utilities Commission of Nevada in the within-entitled matter,
10 and thereafter transcribed the same as herein appears;

11 That the foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 64,
12 inclusive, is a full, true and correct transcription of my
13 stenotype notes of said hearing.

14

15 DATED at Carson City, Nevada, this 19th day of
16 September, 2018.

17

18

19

20 MICHEL LOOMIS, RPR
21 Nevada CCR #228

22

23

24

Brian Sandoval
Governor



Patrick Cates
Director

Ward D. Patrick, PE
Administrator

Carson City Offices:
Public Works Section
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4263
(775) 684-4141 | Fax (775) 684-4142

Buildings & Grounds Section
515 East Musser Street, Suite 102
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4263
(775) 684-1800 | Fax (775) 684-1821

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
Public Works Division

Las Vegas Offices:
Public Works Section
2300 McLeod Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104-4314
(702) 486-5115 | Fax (702) 486-5094

Buildings & Grounds Section
2300 McLeod Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89104-4314
(702) 486-4300 | Fax (702) 486-4308

STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD ACTION ITEM REQUEST
Meeting of December 18, 2018

Agenda Item # 3

SUBJECT TITLE:

For Possible Action: Acceptance and approval of Public Works Board meeting minutes for

August 22 & 23, 2018 -Attached

September 6, 2018 -Attached

DISCUSSION:

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the August 22 & 23, 2018 meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

August 22, 2018

1. Page 25:12 – change “to” to “do”
2. Page 29:23 – delete “As”
3. Page 32:11 – change “say” to “a”
4. Page 49:3 – “if” to “in”
5. Page 51:8 – “upgrading” to “operating”
6. Page 52:23 – “with” to “as”
7. Page 54:8 – “\$300,000” to “300,000”
8. Page 54:22 – “\$5,000” to “5000”
9. Page 55:22 – “use” to “lose”
10. Page 60:8 – “raise along” to “appraisal on”
11. Page 63:3 – “squat” to “swat”
12. Page 65:14 – “sprig” to “spring”
13. Page 67:14 – “doors” to “dollars”
14. Page 75:17 – “implication” to “implementation”
15. Page 75:18 – “that guide on” to “the tide on”
16. Page 101:10 – “flight” to “point”
17. Page 105:4 – “through” to “three of”
18. Page 109:10 – “side” to “site”
19. Page 123:12 – “max” to “match”
20. Page 126:4 – “uphold” to “upgrade”
21. Page 136:1 – “exterior” to “idea”
22. Page 137:4 – “Elcor” to “Elkhorn”
23. Page 141:2 – “solutions” to “solution”

August 23, 2018

1. Page 5:8- change “reduced” to “replaced”
2. Page 8:17- change “times” to “providers”
3. Page 19:5- change “rounds” to “grounds”
4. Page 25:21- change “plan” to “plant”
5. Page 27:13- change “know” to “to”
6. Page 29:2- change “do” to “deal”

7. Page 39:24- change "ward" to "warden"
8. Page 45:24- change "comp" to "cost"
9. Page 63:3- change "bubble" to "trouble"
10. Page 67:24- change "saddle" to "sally"
11. Page 72:12- change "get" to "good"
12. Page 80:10- change "except" to "funded"
13. Page 93:7- change "Chimmits" to "Chimits"
14. Page 97:2- delete "Sights"
15. Page 109:2- change "ward" to "Ward"
16. Page 135:21- change "likely" to "lightly"
17. Page 139:16- change "on" to "by"
18. Page 140:3- change "properties" to "projects"
19. Page 144:7- change "a call to call" to "to calling"
20. Page 157:13- change "considerable" to "suitable"
21. Page 161:16- change "its" to "you've"
22. Page 162:19- add "of" between "level" and "investigation"
23. Page 167:20- change "form" to "conform"
24. Page 169:12- change "value" to "valuable"
25. Page 172:20- change "affordable tanks" to "panel arrays"
26. Page 177:12- change "beds and heads" to "heads in beds"
27. Page 179:5- change "to its" to "that's"
28. Page 182:2- change "any" to "new"
29. Page 183:3- change "of NH" to "old"
30. Page 187:7- add "floods" between "constantly" and "because"
31. Page 190:6- change "movement" to "improvements"
32. Page 193:20- change "1500" to "1000"
33. Page 194:2- delete "movement and this"

Construction Law Counsel has reviewed the September 6, 2018 meeting minutes and recommends the following changes:

September 6, 2018

1. Page 5:14 – "ward" to "Ward"
2. Page 13:22 – "being into our" to "any air"
3. Page 17:13 – "all" to "falling"
4. Page 17:15 – "offering" to "operating"
5. Page 25:14 – "plan" to "plant"
6. Page 28:1 – "column barium" to "columbarium"
7. Page 41:1 – "Shawn" to "Sean"

PRIOR ACTIONS:

None.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS//ISSUES:

Not applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Approve or deny the August 22 & 23, 2018 and September 6, 2018 meeting minutes as amended.

ACTION ITEM:

Motion to approve or deny the August 22 & 23, 2018 and September 6, 2018 meeting minutes as amended herein OR as further amended by the Board.

PREPARED BY: Susan K. Stewart, Construction Law Counsel